

CONFIDENTIAL

18 - 1301/1

Approved For

00100020043-2

Office of Legislative Counsel

22 May 1978

TO: Tony Lapham, General Counsel

Sen. Gravel
Duggs

Based upon your guidance, we sent the attached letter to Senator Gravel in response to his inquiry on behalf of a constituent, [redacted]

Senator Gravel's office has been in touch with us and they are unhappy with our response. Their point is that obviously [redacted] was somehow connected with the University of Montana and/or the Victorian Hotel in San Francisco and has a personal interest in finding out whether these two facilities are involved. Our response would not alleviate her concern unless of course her age would prevent her being involved since the program was terminated in 1964.

The bottom line is that Senator Gravel's office feels that we have not been sufficiently responsive to enable them to satisfy the constituent. What do you suggest we do?

[redacted]

Attachments

Tony - As you know I feel quite strongly that our current humanitarian policy is absolute nonsense. I am not arguing that the legal card is not important, just that it's

Deface the human face in
horse. There is a practical and possibly
what we follow in similar cases, and that
is to provide the assurance unofficially
and attributed to a third party by inference.
For example in a letter from member to
constituent - As you know Equine agency
policy. ~~But the however, there is~~
I have a good authority that the
was not involved. [The good authority
could by reference to oversight committee
essentially be the committee. I can
see committee would find no public
with this]

STAT

PRIORITY